

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume 1, No. 24

January 12, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Our Responsibilities in 1942

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS was founded a year ago to express the convictions of those Christians who felt that the Christian faith offered no easy escape from the hard and sometimes cruel choices of such a world as ours; but that it did offer resources and insights by which our decisions could be made wisely and our responsibilities borne courageously.

A certain inexorable logic of history has reached its culmination and the whole world is now at war. We believe that the logic was inescapable because the world had become one in terms of the economic interdependence of nations and their proximity to each other. If the tyrannies which have grown up in Europe and Asia were to succeed in dominating those two continents, they would also dominate Africa and America. If they are to be defeated, every area and every resource of the world which is still free must contribute to that defeat.

That is, in brief, the logic of history which has drawn us into the struggle. The attack upon Pearl Harbor was merely an event within this general development. The fact that we could not decide whether we had any responsibilities for the preservation of civilization and that our indecision was overruled by historical events ought to fill us with a sense of grateful reverence for the fact that God knows how to make the wrath of man to praise Him. Every nation has been reluctant to fulfill its duties toward a system of justice, so long as injustice did not touch its own interests too directly. This represents the egoistic corruption in all historical striving. No nation is good enough to do what is right, unless its sense of duty is compounded with its impulse of survival. We may be grateful for the fact that we are finally forced to be loyal to interests beyond our own by such a threat to our national life as we have experienced. Thus the providential elements in history have strengthened our reluctant will and overruled our recalcitrant will. We have been thrown into a community of common responsibility by being engulfed in a community of common sorrow.

We are now involved in a very grim struggle, the

end of which cannot be foreseen. It may be that a resolute foe, extremely formidable in military might, is beginning to betray the inner weaknesses which must finally spell the doom of all tyrannies. Nevertheless, the year 1942 will be one of "blood, sweat and tears" for all of us.

During the coming year we shall continue to interpret the world in which we are living in the light of our common faith and we believe that the following points will require special emphasis.

1. We must recognize the responsibilities which have been thrust upon us as citizens of a belligerent nation as solemn duties. They are no less compatible with our faith and our loyalty to God than many other duties and responsibilities which Christians face even when the world is not at war. We cannot support the war with an easy conscience, but we will resist and refute the delusion that we might have had an easier conscience had we permitted the world to sink into slavery. We know of no political strategy which can do justice to our social responsibilities and give us a completely easy conscience.

2. We must resist tyranny and help to establish justice without hatred or bitterness. This can only be done if we avoid self-righteousness; for hatred is the fruit of a one-dimensional moral fervor. Moral fanatics understand the distinction between good and evil, between truth and falsehood, between democracy and tyranny; but they do not know the God in whose sight no man living is justified.

We have sought to refute the illusion that hatred could be avoided by capitulating to tyranny rather than by resisting it. The bitterness of the subjugated nations, compared with the relative absence of hatred among the belligerent powers, proves that the spirit of forgiveness cannot be achieved simply by avoiding conflict. It is injustice not conflict which tends to engender the most bitter hatreds.

To love our enemies cannot mean that we must connive with their injustice. It does mean that beyond all moral distinctions of history we must know

ourselves one with our enemies not only in the bonds of a common humanity but also in the bonds of a common guilt by which that humanity has become corrupted. The Christian faith must persuade us to be humble rather than self-righteous in carrying out our historic tasks. It is this humility which is the source of pity and forgiveness.

3. We must harness all the resources of the Church to fulfill our religious responsibilities to the men in the armed forces and to the sorely tried civilian members of our churches. The Church has a priestly as well as prophetic function. In war time it becomes particularly important that the Gospel be so preached and all the means of grace so administered that men shall know Christ as Saviour as well as moral example, and shall find comfort, as well as moral challenge in the knowledge of God through Christ.

4. We must keep the consciousness of the universal Church alive among all Christians, and strengthen our sense of belonging to it. This Church, which is the body of Christ, is torn and wounded, as is Christ's body, by the sins and conflicts of human history. But wherever real loyalty to the Lord of the Church is maintained, there also a unity is achieved which transcends all historical divisions and conflicts. The Church is a community of grace and not of blood or nation. Its unity may become a resource for the nations when the day of reconstruction dawns. But it is a spiritual resource for Christian people everywhere, even before that day. For as men know themselves to be united in Christ, they realize that momentary historical divisions and conflicts, however important for the moment, are not final.

5. We shall deal at some length with the problems of post-war reconstruction. We must not forget that the task of defeating tyranny is, however taxing, only a negative one; that the world must find a way to just relations between the nations or we shall have fought the war in vain. We shall seek to bring the best minds in our nation to bear upon this problem, and to combine specialized knowledge in the field of economic and international relations with the best insights of prophetic religion.

We do not believe it to be sufficient merely to declare that national sovereignty is incompatible with the Christian ethic; yet we also know that national sovereignty must be abridged if the world is to have a durable peace. We believe that immediate perils have brought America into a responsible relation to the community of free nations. We hope that this relation will become one of continuing rather than fitful responsibility. As far as America is concerned the arrangements after the war must express the fact that we belong to the community of nations; but such

arrangements must not try to make a European nation out of us, when we are in fact a nation whose shores are washed by both the Pacific and the Atlantic oceans. To raise this specific problem is to point out that the peace after the war must be informed by both moral purpose and political astuteness. We must not allow the cynics to make the peace. But they will dictate the peace if the idealists offer only utopian panaceas.

The problems which we face are so tremendous that they can be met only if we use all resources of mind and soul which God has given us and at the same time trust Him for strength for those tasks which lie beyond our powers. In this, as in every great crisis in the life of men and nations, we must "work out our own salvation in fear and trembling," and yet be grateful for the assurance that "it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do His good pleasure."

A Too Sudden Change

The sudden change of front by the isolationists from hysterical opposition to a policy of resisting aggressor nations to a jingoistic support of the war is a little baffling. Would not a studied silence be preferable to the flag waving of Senator Wheeler and the *Chicago Tribune*? Surely the attack on Pearl Harbor has not changed the total international situation so radically as to justify such an about-face. If, as Senator Wheeler has maintained, it is not possible to resist aggression without destroying democracy at home, would it not be better to buy Japan off at any price, even after her attack, than to face the dire consequences which Wheeler predicted? This sudden change may, of course, be prompted by a genuine patriotism. But in that case it ought to be accompanied by a more generous admission of past errors. If we are willing to face overt danger, as it presents itself in an actual attack, we ought to be willing to admit that covert peril (not so very covert either) preceded the actual attack.

Pure pacifism which maintains its purity without regard to political exigencies or historical catastrophes, surely stands on higher ground than this kind of political morality, which changes its course according to the obvious facts of history, but refuses to admit its errors in dealing with the basic facts of history. But the pure pacifists ought to be a little ashamed of their connivance with this political pacifism. Perhaps the pacifist clergyman who wrote us some weeks ago, declaring that Senator Wheeler was a truer exponent of the Christian religion than any interventionist minister, will be kind enough to write us again.

Christianity and the Ideals of the West

JOHN BAILLIE

WHILE the main energies of the people of Great Britain are inevitably engaged in the purely practical task of winning the war, a considerable effort of thought is at the same time being devoted to the clarification of our minds as to the ultimate issues involved in the struggle. In addition to numerous speeches and pronouncements there is also a constant flow of pamphlets and books. Pervading nearly all of them is a broad and general agreement, but there are also important differences which merit our close attention.

What are we fighting for? What is it that we would lose in losing the war and gain in winning it? About the first part of the answer to these questions the agreement is universal: we did not enter this war to gain anything we did not possess but to preserve something which we did possess. This is for us all a war of defence against deliberate aggression which seeks to rob many nations of those things which they hold most dear. And when we are asked to define our war-aims, our first impulse is often to leave it at that. Our only war-aim, we feel like saying, is to call a halt to the Nazi programme of world-domination. Indeed Karl Barth, in his fine and moving *Letter to Great Britain from Switzerland*, seems to rebuke us for wishing to say any more. "What then is this war?" he asks. "It is a large-scale police measure which has become absolutely necessary in order to repulse an active anarchism which has become a principle. . . . And it seems to me that Christians also would do well to regard it in the same way, and only in that way."

What Are We Defending?

There is, however, a further question which may be pressed. It is agreed that this is a purely defensive war; but what exactly is it that we are defending and that Hitlerism is threatening? We are fighting in defence of something that we (and the other nations whose cause we are espousing) already had, but not in defence of *everything* we already had. We are not defending the *status quo ante bellum* in its entirety. Far from it. There were many things in our previous order of society, domestic and international, which many of us would regard as morally indefensible, unworthy to be defended; and if our country seemed to be fighting for the continuance of these things, the world would see a very divided Britain in place of the present remarkably united one. When we say that our only war-aim is defence, we do not mean that our peace-

aim will be the restoration of the previously existing order. Very few want that, and all know that it would in any case be impossible of achievement. The social order in Britain is now changing under our very eyes. Many things are in the melting-pot, the process of melting having been immensely accelerated by war conditions, and it is the hope of most that they will emerge from the pot in a far sounder condition than they entered it. Yet it would obviously be a confusion of thought to say that the achievement of these desirable results is part of our aim in this war. When a man's house is damaged by fire, he will naturally desire to rebuild it into a better house than it was before, but that does not mean that he fed the flames with this aim in view.

What then is it that we are defending, since we are not defending everything that belonged to our former state? Karl Barth's answer seems to be that we are simply defending order against anarchy. This is in essence an ordinary case of police action against criminal assault, and that is all there is to say about it. This war is "a large-scale police measure" against a large-scale manifestation of lawlessness. There are those in Britain who would accept this analysis. They are well aware that Hitler's aggression has many features about it that differentiate it from most other cases of aggression, but they point out that even if it had not, we would still be fighting it, and that therefore these exceptional features cannot really be part of the justification of a war which would be fully justified without them. Others are not so sure of this. They would say that in the absence of an effective system of common international law and of an effective international commonwealth possessing some real sovereignty over the nations, there is no complete analogy between war and police action; that the attack of one nation on another is always a much more complex phenomenon than the assault of one individual upon another; and that the British nation would not now be as united in its war-effort as it admittedly is, were the present war not significantly different from other wars, or no more than another attempt on the part of one nation to disturb the peace of the world by seeking its own interests at the expense of the interests of other nations. This last is an important point. Since 1918 there had appeared in this country a strong and growing revulsion against the whole 'war complex' which had so long beset the world's mind, and it is likely that this tide of sentiment would have led to serious division in our ranks, had not the menace of Hitlerism appeared very different in character from the majority of other

menaces against which we have taken arms in the past. This is why so many are anxious to affirm that, whatever may be true of other wars, we are not in this one concerned merely to defend order (any old order) against lawlessness, but a particular order of things against a threat of a very special and unprecedented kind.

Democracy as Part of Western Civilization

What then is the order of things which we are defending? Some answer that it is the order we know as Western civilization, others that it is democracy. Democracy is easily defined—it stands for the rights of the majority and the sovereignty of public opinion. Western civilization is a more complex phenomenon, but it would be agreed that democracy is *part* of the meaning of it or has at least grown out of the genius of it. No serious-minded person would wish to defend all that Western civilization has contained or implied in the past, yet it is undoubtedly the central values of it that we are defending against the threat of Nazi barbarism. What are these values?

There is no one generally accepted list of them, but if we collate the phrases most commonly used to describe them, it is possible to give a fair answer. In addition to the democratic ideal already mentioned, and balancing its conception of the rights of the majority, there is also the liberal ideal of the rights of the individual—a right which bases itself on the conception of the indefeasible value of the individual human personality. Conjoined to this are the idea of toleration and the “four freedoms.” The battle-cry of the French revolution,—*liberté, égalité, fraternité*—is now widely accepted as a summary statement of these things, and to that triad *humanité* is often added as a fourth, while the whole is often embodied in the conception of “the rights of man.” Clearly these terms do not describe Western civilization as it has actually existed, but they do describe ideals which have been widely and increasingly *assented to* (though seldom lived up to) within it; and they do in a certain way represent what we are now defending and what our enemies are attacking.

Karl Barth in his *Letter* expresses grave concern over our appeal to any such ideals. His ultimate reason for the necessity of resisting Hitler is “simply the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” “But I have been struck,” he writes, “by the fact that in your pronouncements various other conceptions have been put forward as primary and ultimate reasons—such as ‘Western civilization,’ ‘the liberty of the individual,’ ‘freedom of knowledge,’ ‘the infinite value of the human personality,’ ‘the brotherhood of men,’ ‘social justice,’ etc.” He adds indeed that when these terms are set in contrast with the terms employed by our enemies to describe their ideals, “e.g. *Volk, Rasse,*

Soldatentum, Lebensraum, etc.,” he does not hesitate for a moment in his choice between the two; and he is entirely indulgent towards the use of such terms in ordinary discourse. “But,” he says, “I doubt whether I can admit that those conceptions do really describe the grounds upon which we Christians must decide on our Christian attitude to the war. That is to say, I am disturbed by the fact that these conceptions are concerned with principles which might also be those of a pious Hindu, Buddhist or Atheist. . . .”

Common Cause for Christians and Non-Christians

But it may be said that that is just their value. In this war Christians *are* making common cause with many Hindus, Buddhists, Atheists—and not least with many Jews; and there must be a common statement of the case which all these also can accept. To this vitally important point we must return in a moment, but meanwhile let it be remembered that Barth's letter is specifically addressed to his “*Christian Brethren in Great Britain*” and that he is concerned with their specifically *Christian* justification for opposing Hitler. Undoubtedly it is true that the ultimate springs of all the actions of a Christian should be in the wholeness of his Christian faith. All his deeds should be undertaken for the sake of Jesus Christ his Lord who was made flesh and suffered and died and rose again for the salvation of mankind. Nothing he does should be done in any spirit other than this or with any lesser inspiration. Barth is therefore saying something of the very first importance when he protests that the Christian must not be satisfied with an appeal to the above-mentioned common ideals of humanitarianism, egalitarianism and their like.

Here is something of which we cannot be too often reminded, yet it is something of which the Churches in Britain are already very much aware. The ideals mentioned are themselves to a large extent the fruit of Christian influence. There is hardly one of them that could be what it now is, if Christianity had never existed in the world. Of course they owe something of their substance to other sources too—to Roman law and Stoic cosmopolitan ethics and perhaps also to the spirit of the Northern European races. These all had their share in the making of the European tradition which now, under the name of Western civilization, extends in some degree to every corner of the world. Yet it is plain that these other influences were all largely transmuted by the leaven of Christian influence before their distillation into the principles and ideals to which appeal is now made. Beginning with the period of the Renaissance, however, these principles and ideals came more and more to be detached from the Christian theological doctrines which were their original context; and

it is largely in this uprooted form—*déracinés* from their original root—that they are so widely accepted (which is a different thing from being observed) wherever the influence of the Christianised West has penetrated. This uprooting is the cause of a three-fold weakness to which they are now subject:

Weakness of Secular Idealism

The first weakness is a loss of conviction. It was always doubtful how long mere ideals would continue to retain their hold on men's minds, and to engage their emotions, after they had been detached from all belief about the nature of reality; and in our own time it looks as if this limit was beginning to be reached. The ideals of a secularized Western civilisation are now being rudely challenged by an utterly different set of standards in which humanitarianism and liberty and tolerance find no place, but the new standards have precisely this advantage over the old—that they are associated with dogma as well as with many of the ritual accompaniments of worship. The dogma is indeed a spurious and artificial creation, with its doctrines of an Aryan blood-stream, a *Herrenvolk* and a sacred German soil; and the ritual trappings with which it decorates itself are of an equally artificial character; but none the less it is showing itself to be a source of immense cohesive power. The question is, Is the uprooted moral idealism of the West likely to be strong enough to vanquish the demonic force of this new religion?

The second weakness of our uprooted idealism lies in its individualism. The close-knit character given to the community life of the Ages of Faith by the domination of the Christian Church gave place within the modern liberal period to a largely atomistic conception of society. This had its good side in that it won recognition for the right of private opinion and for other private interests, but it also led to a tragic loss of the sense of communal solidarity. And in being transplanted from the soil of community to that of atomistic individualism almost every one of our social ideals suffered a weakening change. The *fraternité* of the French revolution sounds like an ideal of true community, but it has not always turned out to be such. In our own age we are confronted with a remarkable returning hunger for community on the part of the youth of an ever-increasing number of lands. The totalitarian philosophies are catering for this hunger, and therein lies another secret of their great hold on youth. Can we hope to vanquish them with the weapons of a merely individualistic idealism?

But the third weakness of our ideals lies in the fact that, in a much more general way, they have all suffered subtle deterioration and perversion in becoming secularised. It is doubtful, for instance, whether 'the rights of man,' when taken thus by

itself, is a conception to which a Christian can comfortably appeal. Should he not rather think of the duties of man and the rights of God? It is equally doubtful whether the conception of 'the infinite value of the individual' is a true expression of what the Christian believes, though undoubtedly it could never have existed in men's minds in its present form apart from Christian influence. For the Christian only God has infinite value in His own right; and man has only a conferred and derivative value, gained from fellowship with God. Likewise *égalité* is indeed a Christian value, but somehow secularism subtly perverts it. For the Christian we are all equal, not because we are all equally worthy, but because we are all equally sinful. Christian equality is based not on self-assertion, but on penitence. Secularism tends to say, 'I am as good as you are,' but what Christianity taught men to say was rather, 'You are as good as I am.' So also with the ideal of 'the brotherhood of man,' which has always seemed to mean something subtly different since it ceased to be associated with the Fatherhood of God and the elder-brotherhood of Christ.

The ideals of the West have thus suffered deterioration in becoming uprooted. Yet two things are to be said on the other side. The first is that the revolt of the secular period has taught Christians something immensely valuable about the meaning and implication of their own principles. Toleration, freedom of thought and speech, the rights of the majority are all ideas which, though they undoubtedly owe much of their inspiration to Christian influence (so that it was by no accident that they arose within Christian civilization), and though we can now see them to be legitimate extensions of principles inherent in Christianity, were not taught to the world by the organised Christian Church, but largely wrested from the organised ecclesiastical authorities by thinkers and forces outside the Church—though partly also by sects forming within it.

The Fullness of the Christian Faith

But a second point is even more important for our present argument. It has already been hinted at. We have cordially agreed with Barth that the Christian must find the spring of all his actions in the fullness of his Christian faith, that here also he must find his motives and reasons for resisting Hitler's aggression, and that these motives and reasons suffer inevitable deterioration, and partial falsification, when the attempt is made to state them in a detached form. *And yet there are purposes for which the attempt must be made.* Christians are today fighting side by side with the adherents of other religions and with those who are adherents of no religion—with Jews, Mohammedans and atheists—in a common cause. Barth's principles would seem to

imply that we Christians are opposing Hitler for entirely different reasons from these others, but that is not only absurd but also dangerously divisive. We are all, up to a certain point, defending the same values and opposing the same evils. Our British commonwealth, like all others, is a mixed society, and Christians form only one element in it; yet its mixed character causes no rift in its present solid front. It is accordingly absolutely necessary that we should be able to state our case in terms which can be accepted by Christians and non-Christians alike. A Christian's reasons can never be quite identical with a Jew's, nor either with an atheist's. But there may (and must, if there is to be any truly united witness and action) be in them all a Highest Common Factor. This Highest Common Factor in

the various positive faiths and codes is precisely what was originally meant by that Natural Law, the appeal to which is so much deprecated by Barth. Natural Law is not, in fact, a term which is now very familiar to us in the English-speaking world. Far from hearing it too often upon our lips, Barth would have to explain to most of us what he meant by it. Yet we must have *some* conception that will serve the ends of our common cause. All a Christian's ideals must indeed be grounded in the incarnation and passion and resurrection of our Lord, but he must be content to express himself in other and reduced terms in such of his pronouncements as are intended to rally to a common effort those who do not share his own Christian faith. It is difficult to feel, therefore, that Barth's friendly protest is entirely justified.

“Towards a Christian Britain”

Excerpts from a Report of a Commission of the British Churches on
“Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction”

Editorial Note—Just as the war was breaking out, the British Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility came into being. It consists of official representatives from all principal communions in Great Britain except the Church of Rome, with the Archbishop of York as chairman. During the past year, it has conducted “Religion and Life Weeks” in a number of British cities with notable spiritual results. It carries on a vigorous youth program. It sponsors international fellowships among exiled Christians now resident in Britain. It has brought out an authoritative survey of the problems of Evacuation.

The Commission's latest work, too lengthy for reproduction in full, is here outlined. We give excerpts from the two central sections and brief summaries of the introductory and concluding sections. It is hoped that this digest, while necessarily unfair to the Report, will give a true impression of its substance and lead many to a careful study of the document itself which will shortly be published as a pamphlet.

I. INTRODUCTION.

(The Report opens with an analysis of the world's problem of economic order. It notes “Inherent Difficulties” partly in the technical complexity of modern society, partly in universal defects in human nature. It discovers two “Hopeful Factors”—“the increasing realization . . . that very big social changes are inevitable and rightly due” and “the present accentuation of the British repugnance to irresponsible power.”)

II. THE FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES OF SOCIETY.

(These are found in the basic constitution and necessities of man's nature. “In virtue of his social nature man needs to live in habitual co-operation with his fellows. . . . But he is universally prone to be over-assertive of his own right, and negligent and evasive with regard to his duties. . . . He therefore needs the support and check of institutions and customs.” Hence the need for provision of safeguards against man's sinful tendencies and the cultivation of his “incipient sense of obligation” through the outline of a “new Charter for Today” which shall set forth “the rights and responsibilities” most requiring assertion in contemporary economic society.)

III. AN ECONOMIC CHARTER FOR TODAY.

1. Charter for the Individual.

(i) Every man should have the opportunity of a decent house, a healthy childhood, an education suited to his abilities and a chance to develop and express his social and spiritual nature—in work, in leisure and in retirement—to a degree according with the wealth-producing capacity of his day.

(ii) Every man should be permanently entitled to a position in industry for which he is fitted.

(iii) No man should be dislodged from his place in industry by arbitrary dismissal, but only by orderly process.

(iv) No man should suffer arbitrary reduction in his standard of life or degradation of his standard of work.

(v) Every man should have an effective share in the determination of the policy of his industry.

2. Charter for Industry.

(i) Industrial units should be assisted to realise the above standards by the development of appropriate forms of co-ordinated activity.

(ii) Every useful and efficient industrial unit should be safeguarded from vicious forms of competition.

(iii) Industry as a whole should have means for the orderly transfer of labour from one industry to another.

(iv) Each industry should be provided with means of estimating the current real need for its products to help it to determine and maintain fair prices and fair conditions of labour.

(v) The nation's credit should be used and its financial policy planned with the primary object of enabling industry to fulfil its functions of supplying human needs and directing labour to the greatest advantage of all concerned.

3. Charter for World Economy.

(i) Every nation and community should be safeguarded against forms of trading which involve their economic exploitation.

(ii) No nation or community should have its economy imperilled by the financial or political action of any other nation.

(iii) The right of access to the raw materials of the world should be assured on equal terms to all nations and communities which duly respect the rights of others in their commercial and political activities.

(iv) Poorer nations and communities should be assisted to develop a higher economic capacity and standard of living, by means which will not make them subject to exploitation by other communities.

(v) International trade and finance should be guided by the above principles, and where necessary they should be controlled by an international authority.

IV. THE NEW BRITAIN WE SEEK.

Men do not generally act out of a bare and abstract perception of duty; they require also that strong stimulus to the will which imagination supplies when it foretells in concrete pictures desirable results of right action. We proceed, therefore, to draw a picture of the kind of community which must arise when the basic assumptions set forth above become the inspiring principles of the nation's economy. We picture a new Britain arising from the ashes of the present conflagration.

1. Justice.

In the New Britain we seek:

The just demand for a "living wage" will never again be ruled out of court on the plea that this may be "more than industry can bear."

The provision of a generous standard of life for all who are willing to take their due part in the work of the nation will be the first charge on industry as a whole.

The education of no boy or girl will be cut short three or four years before body and mind have matured.

No man will find himself doomed to physical or cultural starvation, nor to poverty as the inevitable attendant upon sickness or infirmity; and none will be compelled to end his days in burdensome dependence on his children. . . .

2. Security.

In the New Britain we seek:

No man will have to fear the wreck of his home life and the destruction of his power to fulfil his family responsibilities through changes of employment quite beyond his own prevision or control.

The nation will no longer allow the major decisions in industry and finance . . . to be taken by a handful of people who are not bound to answer for the social consequences of their decisions. . . .

Nor will the nation any longer allow the peace of the world to be endangered by a like irresponsibility in the conduct of its international trade and finance. . . .

3. Freedom.

In the New Britain we seek:

A wider and better grounded choice of occupation will result from the prolongation of education.

Freedom of association will be more carefully safeguarded. . . .

The direction of industry will become a more equal partnership of the representatives of production, distribution, administration, and capital together with those of the consumer and community interests. . . .

No person will be so over-pressed in the earning of his livelihood that he has not the leisure for the development of his religious life or opportunity for corporate worship.

4. Responsibility.

In the New Britain we seek:

Home, school and Church will be training-grounds where the wisdom of responsible living will pervade all instruction, and its practice be induced in gradually widening reaches of experience.

Honest labour of hand and mind will be recognised

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
HELEN LANE ROBERTS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

as due from all who share in the products of industry; impairment of efficiency through habits of self-indulgence as disloyalty to the commonwealth of industry; and all slackness or incompetence as a form of theft.

Dishonour will attach to gambling in all its forms as an irresponsible use of wealth, and not least to market and exchange operations through which wealth changes hands without any service having been rendered. . . .

V. IMMEDIATE POLITICAL OBJECTIVES.

(These embrace specific provisions for Home and Family, for Education, for Agriculture and Rural Life, for Employment, for International Trade, and for the regulation of Finance.)

VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHRISTIAN CITIZENS.

This final chapter deals with public opinion, direct political action, and the dynamic of religious faith. The report closes as follows:

To collapse in war would be hardly less disastrous to our nation than to relapse after victory into the apathy of fatigue and to slip back into the dismal errors of the past. We shall need unexampled vision, creative energy and staying-power if the difficult post-war years are to bring to birth a new Britain and a new world. On the scale on which they will be required, such qualities spring only from the deepest levels of man's being, where the human touches the divine and the temporal draws strength from the

eternal. The Church believes in a righteous and loving God who rules and over-rules the events of history, whose purpose of good and power to bring good out of evil have been once for all made plain in the life, death and victory of Jesus Christ. To bring this faith to bear upon the stupendous tasks ahead will mean bringing to them a clear-sighted compunction for existing evils, the will to make any personal sacrifices of wealth or power demanded by a just social order, a steadfast rejection of all bitter or fearful resistance to change, and an unshakable hope for the future. This temper of mind and spirit, continually renewed at the springs of faith, is the most important, although the least palpable, contribution which Christians can make to the work of reconstruction. Without it there is no security against the bedevilment and disillusion which dog men's efforts to save themselves apart from God.

Norwegian Pastors Are Adamant

A Swedish newspaper reports that the questionnaire sent by the Nazis to all Norwegian pastors, asking them to take a stand on the war against Communism, previously reported in these pages, has remained unanswered by practically all clergymen of the nation.

The Quisling organ "Fritt Folk" makes another attack upon Bishop Berggrav in the issue of October 17th. It charges that the Bishop has asked for a day of prayer in all the churches, without specifying what the churches are to pray for. It shrewdly suspects that they are not going to pray for the Nazi government.

Author in this Issue

Professor John Baillie was called from the chair of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary to his Alma Mater, Edinburgh University, in 1935. His work in theology is well known on both sides of the Atlantic. Professor Baillie visited America last spring and was heard in many parts of the country. His article in this issue was written before our entrance into the war, but loses none of its relevance for this reason. His lucid analysis of points of agreement and disagreement between the position taken by Karl Barth and that held by most British Christians is an important contribution to our religious thought.

Announcement

We have sent a ballot-subscription to our subscribers asking them to indicate whether in their opinion *Christianity and Crisis*, which is just about to close its first year, should be continued. We hope our readers will return these ballots so that we may make our plans accordingly. We believe that we have a modest mission in the religious life of our nation, but we need a response from our readers before we make our plans.

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

650 1-43